

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01382 122029Z

70

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 CU-02 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 BIB-01

OES-03 EB-07 CIEP-01 COME-00 NEA-09 STR-01 /100 W

----- 015852

P 121830Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 591

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 5123

USDEL SALT II GENEVA

USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

CINCLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

S E C R E T USNATO 1382

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, PFOR, NATO

SUBJ: CBM'S - CANADIAN PROPOSAL ON NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS

REF: (A) USNATO 1176(NOTAL); (B) GENEVA 1592; (C) GENEVA 1516

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

BEGIN SUMMARY: AT MARCH 11 POLADS, IMS REP ELABORATED ON IMS ESTIMATES OF THE POTENTIAL NUMBER OF MILITARY MANEUVERS THAT MIGHT BE SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION. CONSENSUS OF COMMITTEE WAS THAT PRIMARY FORUM FOR ALLIED COORDINATION ON CANADIAN MATRIX PROPOSAL SHOULD BE GENEVA, BUT THAT POLADS MIGHT HOLD FUTURE DISCUSSIONS IF THIS BECAME DESIRABLE. END SUMMARY.

1. AT MARCH 11 POLADS, IMS REP (COLONEL WOLF - BELGIUM) CON-

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01382 122029Z

FIRMED IMS PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF MANEUVERS WHICH MIGHT BE SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION (SEE REF A, PARAS 4 AND 5). ACCORDING TO IMS INFORMATION, NATO COUNTRIES HOLD EACH YEAR ON THE AVERAGE 13-15 NATIONAL MANEUVERS AT DIVISION LEVEL,

AND THREE CORPOS-LEVEL NATIONAL MANEUVERS.

2. AMONG NATO COUNTRIES THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF TROOPS INVOLVED IN MANEUVERS AT THE DIVISION LEVEL WAS 16,000, THE SOLE EXCEPTION BEING THE NETHERLANDS, WHICH CARRIED OUT DIVISION-LEVEL MANEUVERS OF APPROXIMATELY 20,000 MEN ONCE EVERY THREE YEARS. IMS REP ADDED THAT UNTIL NOW THE REFORGER EXERCISE HAD BEEN CONDUCTED UNDER U.S. COMMAND BUT THAT STUDIES WERE UNDER WAY WHICH AIMED AT PUTTING REFORGER UNDER ALLIED COMMAND EUROPE.

3. IN CONFIRMING THE FIGURE OF NINE MANEUVERS CONDUCTED BY WP NATIONAL AUTHORITIES AND EIGHT CONDUCTED BY THE PACT ITSELF IN 1974, IMS REP POINTED OUT THAT THE NINE NATIONAL MANEUVERS DID NOT INCLUDE MANEUVERS BY THE USSR AND ROMANIA. IMS REP SAID INFORMATION ON THE NUMBER OF NATIONAL MANEUVERS CONDUCTED BY THE USSR WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO THE IMS, WHICH HAS TO RELY ON INFORMATION FROM NATIONAL SOURCES. HE REMINDED THE COMMITTEE THAT ARMY-CORPS LEVEL DOES NOT EXIST IN WP ARMED FORCES.

4. IMS REP FURTHER NOTED THAT THE CONCEPT OF A DIVISION IS HIGHLY VARIABLE, WITH THE SIZE OF NATO MEMBER COUNTRY DIVISIONS RANGING FROM 10,000 TO 18,000 MEN. WHAT CONSTITUTES A "REINFORCED DIVISION" IS ALSO VAGUE, HE CONTINUED, POINTING OUT THAT MOST NATO MANEUVERS ARE CONDUCTED BY A SINGLE DIVISION WITH SOME REINFORCEMENT. (TEXT OF IMS REP'S PRESENTATION WILL BE SENT SEPTEL.)

5. IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION FROM THE NETHERLANDS REP (HORAK), IMS REP SAID THAT FIGURES FOR NATO NATIONAL MANEUVERS INCLUDED FRANCE, BUT EXCLUDED GREECE SINCE NO INFORMATION ON THE LATTER COUNTRY HAD BEEN RECEIVED.

6. DANISH REP (MORCK) REPORTED HIS AUTHORITIES GENERALLY FAVORED THE CANADIAN MATRIX PROPOSAL BUT THOUGHT FURTHER EXAMINATION OF IT WAS NEEDED IN GENEVA. FRENCH REP (BEAUCHATAUD) WONDERED WHETHER CANADIAN PROPOSAL COULD STAND CLOSE SCRUTINY IN VIEW OF ELASTICITY OF DEFINITIONS OF A DIVISION AND NON-EXISTENCE OF ARMY

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01382 122029Z

CORPS ON WP SIDE.

7. FRG REP (CITRON) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES THOUGHT ADVANTAGES IN CANADIAN PROPOSAL OUTWEIGHED POSSIBLE RISKS. BONN SEES THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL ADVANTAGES:

(A) IT COULD BE A BASIS FOR SUBSTANTIVE NEGOTIATIONS;
(B) THE POSITION OF THE NEUTRALS WAS REFLECTED;
(C) THE WP COUNTRIES COULD NOT AVOID ADDRESSING THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL;
(D) THE ABSENCE OF MENTION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT WAS ALSO A POSITIVE ELEMENT, AS THIS COULD BE NEGOTIATED SEPARATELY.

ON THE OTHER HAND, BONN SAW THE FOLLOWING POSSIBLE DANGERS IN

THE CANADIAN APPROACH:

- (A) THE WP STATES MIGHT VIEW IT AS A SOFTENING OF THE WESTERN POSITION;
- (B) THE COMPLEXITY OF THE MATRIX MIGHT LEAD TO WP NIT-PICKING ON TECHNICAL POINTS;
- (C) THE WP STATES MIGHT PICK THE FAVORABLE ELEMENTS IN THE CANADIAN PACKAGE, DISCARDING WHAT THEY DID NOT LIKE;

8. IN SUM, HOWEVER, THE FRG REP SAID BONN THOUGHT THE RISKS COULD BE AVOIDED BY INSISTING ON SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE WP AND ON THE NEED FOR EARLY PROGRESS. THE FRG REP FURTHER NOTED THAT WHILE HIS AUTHORITIES PREFER THAT DETAILED DISCUSSIONS OF THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL TAKE PLACE IN BRUSSELS; IF A MAJORITY FAVORED GENEVA AS THE LOCUS, BONN WOULD AGREE.

9. U.S. REP (LEDOGAR) SAID HIS IMPRESSION WAS THAT THE GENEVA NATO CAUCUS CONSENSUS FAVORED KEEPING GENEVA AS THE MAIN FORUM FOR ALLIED COORDINATION ON THIS SUBJECT. AS A PERSONAL SUGGESTION, THE U.S. REP SAID IT MIGHT BE USEFUL FOR THE IMS TO INFORMALLY EXAMINE THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL WITH A VIEW TO PINPOINTING POSSIBLE TECHNICAL IMPROVEMENTS OR POTENTIAL TRAPS TO BE AVOIDED. SUCH AN APPROACH COULD GIVE NATO DELEGATIONS IN GENEVA THE BENEFIT OF THE IMS'S EXPERTISE.

10. NORWEGIAN REP (GAARDER) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES DOUBT THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL WILL LEAD TO SIGNIFICANT RESULTS IN THE ABSENCE OF AGREEMENT ON CBM'S AT THE POLITICAL LEVEL.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01382 122029Z

11. U.K. REP (MARGETSON) SAID TACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS APPEAR TO BE PRIMARY IN GENEVA AT THIS TIME, AND IT WAS THEREFORE PREFERABLE THAT FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL TAKE PLACE IN GENEVA.

12. CHAIRMAN (KILLHAM) SUMMED UP SAYING CONSENSUS OF COMMITTEE APPEARED TO BE THAT GENEVA SHOULD BE MAIN FORUM FOR ALLIED EXAMINATION OF CANADIAN PROPOSAL, BUT THAT THIS SHOULD NOT EXCLUDE A POSSIBLE FUTURE POLADS' ROLE IF ALLIES DEEM THIS APPROPRIATE.BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 MAR 1975
Decapton Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decapton Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO01382
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrzise.tel
Line Count: 153
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 1176(NOTAL); (B) GENEVA 1592; (C) GENEVA 1516
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <08 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CBM'S - CANADIAN PROPOSAL ON NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS
TAGS: CSCE, PFOR, NATO
To: STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
SALT II GENEVA
GENEVA
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
CINCLANT

USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006